



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,510	10/12/2005	Karl Volz	27611/39620A	8561
4743 7590 12/31/2007 MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606			EXAMINER ROMEO, DAVID S	
			ART UNIT 1647	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/31/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/529,510

Applicant(s)

VOLZ ET AL.

Examiner

David S. Romeo

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed 03/28/2005 has been entered. Claims 1–12 and 16–21 are pending.

The application is not fully in compliance with the sequence rules, 37 C.F.R. § 1.821-
5 1.825. Specifically, the specification fails to recite the appropriate sequence identifiers at each
place where a sequence is discussed. See, for example, claim 2. This is not meant to be an
exhaustive list of places where the specification fails to comply with the sequence rules. The
specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all
possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any other errors in
10 sequence compliance. The application cannot issue until it is in compliance. Nucleic acid
sequences with 10 or more nucleotides, at least 4 of which are specifically defined, must comply
with the sequence rules. Amino acid sequences with 4 or more residues, at least 4 of which are
specifically defined, must comply with the sequence rules. Sequence identifiers can also be used
to discuss and/or claim parts or fragments of a properly presented sequence. For example,
15 language such as “residues 14 to 243 of SEQ ID NO:23” is permissible and the fragment need
not be separately presented in the “Sequence Listing.”

Correction is required.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

20 This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not
so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-4, 16 and 21 drawn to a PEDF fragment.

- 5 Group II, claim(s) 5-12 and 17-18, drawn to a method of treatment comprising administering a PEDF fragment.

Group III, claim(s) 19 and 20, drawn to a method of determining the ration of VEGF to PEDF.

- 10 The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the inventions of groups I-III to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept of groups I-III is a PEDF fragment. However, the international search
15 report filed in PCT/US03/30264 indicates that a PEDF fragment cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept. Therefore, the inventions of groups I-III do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention.

- 20 This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- (a) T GALVEEEDPF;
(b) ERTESIHRALYYDLIS; and
25 (c) DPFFKVPVNKLAAVSNFGYDLYRVRSSMSPTTN.

- Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive
30 unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP

5 § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:
claim 2 corresponds to the species listed above.

10 The following claim(s) are generic: 1–12 and 17–21.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is
15 necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept of the species is a PEDF fragment. However, the international search report filed in PCT/US03/30264 indicates that a PEDF fragment cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept. Therefore, the species do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention. .

20

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

25 The species are as follows:

a method of treating cancer comprising administering a PEDF fragment, and
a method of treating an ophthalmologic disorder comprising administering a PEDF
fragment.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims
30 shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify

the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of
5 claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

10 claims 10 and 18 correspond to the species a method of treating an ophthalmologic disorder comprising administering a PEDF fragment;

15 claims 11 and 17 correspond to the species a method of treating cancer comprising administering a PEDF fragment.

The following claim(s) are generic: 5, 7-9 and 12.

20 The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: In order for the species to have unity of invention it is necessary that the inventive concept be a contribution over the prior art. The inventive concept of the species is method of inhibiting angiogenesis with a PEDF fragment. However, the international search report filed in PCT/US03/30264 indicates that inhibiting angiogenesis with a
25 PEDF fragment cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive concept. Therefore, the species do not fulfill the requirements for unity of invention. .

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed
30 (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

Art Unit: 1647

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

ANY INQUIRY CONCERNING THIS COMMUNICATION OR EARLIER COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE EXAMINER SHOULD BE DIRECTED TO DAVID S. ROMEO WHOSE TELEPHONE NUMBER IS (571) 272-0890. THE EXAMINER CAN NORMALLY BE REACHED ON MONDAY THROUGH FRIDAY FROM 9:00 A.M. TO 5:30 P.M. IF ATTEMPTS TO REACH THE EXAMINER BY TELEPHONE ARE UNSUCCESSFUL, THE EXAMINER'S SUPERVISOR, MANJUNATH RAO, CAN BE REACHED AT (571) 272-0939.

IF SUBMITTING OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE BY FAX, APPLICANTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO SUBMIT OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE TO THE CENTRAL FAX NUMBER FOR OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE, WHICH IS (571) 273-8300.

CUSTOMERS ARE ALSO ADVISED TO USE CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE PROCEDURES WHEN SUBMITTING A REPLY TO A NON-FINAL OR FINAL OFFICE ACTION BY FACSIMILE (SEE 37 CFR 1.6 AND 1.8).

ANY INQUIRY OF A GENERAL NATURE OR RELATING TO THE STATUS OF THIS APPLICATION OR PROCEEDING MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE PATENT APPLICATION INFORMATION RETRIEVAL (PAIR) SYSTEM. STATUS INFORMATION FOR PUBLISHED APPLICATIONS MAY BE OBTAINED FROM EITHER PRIVATE PAIR OR PUBLIC PAIR. STATUS INFORMATION FOR UNPUBLISHED APPLICATIONS IS AVAILABLE THROUGH PRIVATE PAIR ONLY. FOR MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE PAIR SYSTEM, SEE [HTTP://PAIR-DIRECT.USPTO.GOV](http://pair-direct.uspto.gov). CONTACT THE ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER (EBC) AT 866-217-9197 (TOLL-FREE) FOR QUESTIONS ON ACCESS TO THE PRIVATE PAIR SYSTEM,

/DAVID ROMEO/
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1647

DSR
DECEMBER 27, 2007